Spectral Properties of the Two-Dimensional Laplacian with a Finite Number of Point Interactions

T. Shigehara[1], H. Mizoguchi[1], T. Mishima[1] and Taksu Cheon[2]
[1]Department of Information and Computer Sciences, Saitama University
Shimo-Okubo, Urawa, Saitama 338 Japan
[2]Laboratory of Physics, Kochi University of Technology
Tosa Yamada, Kochi 782 Japan

We discuss spectral properties of the Laplacian with multiple (N) point interactions in two-dimensional bounded regions. A mathematically sound formulation for the problem is given within the framework of the self-adjoint extension of a symmetric (Hermitian) operator in functional analysis. The eigenvalues of this system are obtained as the poles of a transition matrix which has size N. Closely examining a generic behavior of the eigenvalues of the transition matrix as a function of the energy, we deduce the general condition under which point interactions have a substantial effect on statistical properties of the spectrum.

arXiv:quant-ph/9710005v1 1 Oct 1997

I. INTRODUCTION

The Laplacian is one of fundamental operators which describe real systems and indeed appears in various fields such as classical mechanics, electromagnetic dynamics, fluid dynamics, quantum mechanics and so on. The eigenvalue problem of the Laplacian, in particular, has a direct relation to the microscopic world where quantum mechanics governs the dynamics. The eigenvalues of the Laplacian on a bounded region, ω_i, $i = 1, \cdots$, exactly correspond to the allowable energies of a free particle moving in a microscopic billiard, which are discrete in general, and each eigenfunction, $\psi_i(\vec{x})$, describes the wave function of the corresponding eigenstate, the square of which, $|\psi_i(\vec{x})|^2$, expresses the probability such that the particle with energy ω_i exists at a position $\vec{x}$ in the billiard.

The quantum billiard problem is a natural idealization of the particle motion in microscopic bounded regions. The one-electron problem in "quantum dots" is a possible setting which may be used as a single-electron memory, a promising computational device in the future. It is now possible to actually construct such structures with extremely pure semiconductors thanks to the rapid progress in the mesoscopic technology. Real systems are, however, not free from impurities which affect the particle motion inside. In the presence of a small amount of contamination, even a single-particle problem becomes unmanageable. The modeling of the impurities with point interactions is expected to make the problem easy to handle without changing essential dynamics.

Apart from the applicability to physical systems with a microscopic or mesoscopic scale, the Laplacian with point interactions is an attractive object from a viewpoint of dynamical systems. The two-dimensional quantum billiard is an appropriate tool for examining generic features of dynamical systems because of the wide rage of dynamical behaviors, going from the most regular (integrable) to the most irregular (chaotic) depending on the geometry of its boundary. Although no mathematical proof exists, it is widely believed that fingerprints of the regular or irregular nature of the classical motion can be found in statistical properties of the spectrum (eigenvalues and eigenfunctions) in the corresponding quantum system [1]. One of such statistical measures is the nearest-neighbor level spacing distribution $P(S)$, which is defined such that $P(S)dS$ is the probability to find the spacing between any two neighboring energy levels in the interval $(S, S + dS)$. Integrable systems such as circular, elliptic and rectangular billiards obey Poisson statistics;

$$P(S) = \exp(-S). \tag{1}$$

(It is conventional to take a unit of the energy such that the average level spacing is one. Namely, $P(S)$ satisfies $\int_0^\infty SP(S)dS = 1$ as well as $\int_0^\infty P(S)dS = 1$.) On the other hand, chaotic systems such as Sinai's billiard and Bunimovich's stadium are described by the prediction of the Gaussian orthogonal ensembles;

$$P(S) = \frac{\pi S}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{\pi S^2}{4}\right). \tag{2}$$

There are other statistics suitable for a measure of the degree of regularity (or irregularity), such as Δ_3-statistic introduced by Dyson and Mehta [2,3]. From a viewpoint of dynamical systems, the integrable billiards with point interactions inside are classified into a category called "pseudointegrable". The nature of classical motion in the pseudointegrable systems is integrable in the sense that a set of unstable trajectories are of measure zero in the phase space. However, several numerical experiments show that under a certain condition, quantization induces the chaotic

energy spectra, which might be regarded as a counterexample for the correspondence between the level statistics and the underlying classical motion.

One of the main purposes of this paper is to clarify the condition under which the statistical properties of quantum spectrum are substantially affected by point interactions. We spend a large portion of the paper in giving a mathematical background to answer this question. In spite of its seeming simplicity, a careful treatment is demanded for point interactions in quantum mechanics in case of the spatial dimension $d \geq 2$. Relying on the self-adjoint extension theory in functional analysis, we give a general formula suitable for the resolvent (Green's function) which describes a particle propagation in quantum billiard with point interactions. It is hard to proceed further without losing any generality; Numerics is, in general, demanded to calculate each eigenvalue (pole of the Green's function) and the corresponding eigenfunction. By introducing suitable approximations for examining statistical properties on spectrum, however, we deduce the condition for the strong coupling where the effect of point interactions on the quantum spectrum is maximal.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec.II, the Green's function for the Laplacian with a finite number of point interactions is deduced in a mathematically sound manner. We discuss the condition for the strong coupling for the case of a single interaction in Sec.III, which is extended to the case of multiple interactions in Sec.IV. The present work is summarized in Sec.V.

II. FORMULATION OF QUANTUM BILLIARDS WITH POINT INTERACTIONS

We start from an empty billiard. Let us consider a quantum particle of mass M moving freely in a bounded region S in two spatial dimension. The wave functions are assumed to vanish on its boundary ∂S. We denote the eigenvalues and corresponding eigenfunctions of the system as ε_n and φ_n, namely

$$H_0 \equiv -\frac{\Delta}{2M}, \quad H_0\varphi_n(\vec{x}) = \varepsilon_n\varphi_n(\vec{x}), \quad n = 1, \cdots \tag{3}$$

with

$$\varphi_n(\vec{x}) = 0 \quad \text{where} \quad \vec{x} \in \partial S. \tag{4}$$

The Hamiltonian H_0 is the kinetic operator in $L^2(S)$ with domain $D(H_0) = H^2(S) \cap H_0^1(S)$ in terms of the Sobolev spaces. According to the Weyl formula, the average level (eigenvalue) density is given by

$$\rho_{av} = \frac{MS}{2\pi} \tag{5}$$

where we denote the area of S by the same symbol. Note that ρ_{av} is independent of the energy ω in two dimension. Assuming $\varphi_n(\vec{x})$ to be normalized to unity, the Green's function of H_0 is given by

$$G^{(0)}(\vec{x}, \vec{x}'; \omega) \equiv (\omega - H_0)^{-1}(\vec{x}, \vec{x}') = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\varphi_n(\vec{x})\varphi_n(\vec{x}')}{\omega - \varepsilon_n}. \tag{6}$$

We now place N point interactions at $\vec{x}_1, ..., \vec{x}_N$. Naively, one defines the interactions in terms of the Dirac's delta function in two dimension;

$$H = H_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{N} v_i \ \delta(\vec{x} - \vec{x}_i). \tag{7}$$

However, the Hamiltonian H is not mathematically sound for spatial dimension $d \geq 2$. This can be seen even in case of a single interaction ($N = 1$). In this case, the eigenvalue equation of H is reduced to

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\varphi_n(\vec{x}_1)^2}{\omega - \varepsilon_n} = v_1^{-1}. \tag{8}$$

However, since the average level density is constant with respect to the energy, the infinite series on the left hand side does not converge in two dimension. For higher dimensions, the average level density has a positive power dependence of the energy, which makes the series divergent. To handle the divergence, a scheme for regularization

and renormalization is called for. One of the most mathematically satisfying schemes is given by the self-adjoint extension theory of functional analysis [4].

We first consider in $L^2(S)$ the nonnegative operator

$$H_X = -\frac{\Delta}{2M}\Big|_{C_0^\infty(S-X)} \tag{9}$$

with its closure $\bar{H}_X$ in $L^2(S)$, where we set $X = \{\vec{x}_1, ..., \vec{x}_N\}$. Namely, we restrict $D(H_0)$ to the functions which vanish at the position of the point interactions. By using integration by parts, it is easy to prove that the operator $\bar{H}_X$ is symmetric (Hermitian). But it is not self-adjoint. Indeed, the equation

$$\bar{H}_X^* \psi(\omega, \vec{x}) = \omega \psi(\omega, \vec{x}), \quad \psi \in D(\bar{H}_X^*), \quad Im\ \omega \neq 0, \tag{10}$$

has the N independent solutions [5]

$$\psi_i(\omega, \vec{x}) = G^{(0)}(\vec{x}, \vec{x}_i; \omega), \quad \vec{x} \in S - X, \quad i = 1, \cdots, N, \tag{11}$$

indicating

$$D(\bar{H}_X^*) = D(\bar{H}_X) \oplus \overline{Ran(\bar{H}_X - \omega)}^{\perp} \oplus \overline{Ran(\bar{H}_X - \bar{\omega})}^{\perp} \neq D(\bar{H}_X), \quad Im\ \omega \neq 0. \tag{12}$$

Since $\bar{H}_X$ has the deficiency indices (N, N), $\bar{H}_X$ has, in general, N^2-parameter family of self-adjoint extensions. All self-adjoint extensions $H_{U,X}$ of $\bar{H}_X$ are given by [6,7]

$$\begin{aligned} D(H_{U,X}) &= \{f + \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_i(\psi_{i+} + \sum_{j=1}^{N} U_{ij}\psi_{j-}) | f \in \bar{H}_X, c_i \in \mathbf{C}\}, \\ H_{U,X}\{f + \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_i(\psi_{i+} + \sum_{j=1}^{N} U_{ij}\psi_{j-})\} &= \bar{H}_X f + i\Lambda \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_i(\psi_{i+} - \sum_{j=1}^{N} U_{ij}\psi_{j-}), \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where U_{ij} denotes a N-dimensional unitary matrix and

$$\psi_{j\pm}(\vec{x}) = \psi_j(\pm i\Lambda, \vec{x}), \quad \Lambda > 0, \quad j = 1, \cdots, N, \tag{14}$$

provide a basis for $Ker(\bar{H}_X^* \mp i\Lambda) = \overline{Ran(\bar{H}_X \pm i\Lambda)}^{\perp}$, respectively. Positive Λ is regarded as a mass scale which can be arbitrarily fixed. The operator $H_{U,X}$ corresponds to the Hamiltonian for the system with N point interactions. The special case $U = -1$ leads to the kinetic operator in $L^2(S)$, $H_{-1,X} = H_0$, since $\psi_{j+} - \psi_{j-} \in D(H_0)$.

By using Krein's formula, we can obtain the relation between two resolvents $(\omega - H_0)^{-1}$ and $(\omega - H_{U,X})^{-1}$ for the unperturbed and perturbed systems respectively. Assume that $\bar{A}$ is a densely defined, closed symmetric operator in some Hilbert space with deficiency indices (N, N). Let B and C be two self-adjoint extensions of $\bar{A}$ and denote by $\dot{A}$ the maximal common part of B and C. Let M, $0 < M \leq N$, be the deficiency indices of $\dot{A}$ and let $\{\phi_1(\omega), \cdots, \phi_M(\omega)\}$, which are linearly independent, span the corresponding deficiency subspace of $\dot{A}$;

$$\dot{A}^* \phi_i(\omega) = \omega \phi_i(\omega), \quad \phi_i \in D(\dot{A}^*), \quad i = 1, \cdots, M, \quad Im\ \omega \neq 0. \tag{15}$$

Then Krein's Formula reads

Theorem Let B, C, $\bar{A}$ and $\dot{A}$ be as above. Then

$$(\omega - B)^{-1} - (\omega - C)^{-1} = -\sum_{i,j=1}^{M} \lambda_{ij}(\omega) \langle \phi_j(\bar{\omega}), \cdot \rangle \phi_i(\omega), \quad \omega \in \rho(B) \cap \rho(C), \tag{16}$$

where the matrix $\lambda(\omega)$ is nonsingular for $\omega \in \rho(B) \cap \rho(C)$ and $\lambda_{ij}(\omega)$ and $\phi_j(\omega)$, $i, j = 1, \cdots, M$, may be chosen to be analytic in $\omega \in \rho(B) \cap \rho(C)$. Indeed, $\phi_i(\omega)$ can be defined as

$$\phi_i(\omega) = \phi_i(\omega_0) - (\omega - \omega_0)(\omega - C)^{-1}\phi_i(\omega_0), \quad i = 1, \cdots, M, \quad \omega \in \rho(C), \tag{17}$$

where $\phi_i(\omega_0)$, $i = 1, \cdots, M$, $Im\ \omega_0 \neq 0$, are linearly independent solutions of Eq.(15) for $\omega = \omega_0$ and the inverse matrix of $\lambda(\omega)$ satisfies

$$\lambda_{ij}^{-1}(\omega) = \lambda_{ij}^{-1}(\omega') - (\omega - \omega')\langle \phi_j(\bar{\omega}), \phi_i(\omega')\rangle, \quad i,j = 1, \cdots, M, \quad \omega, \omega' \in \rho(B) \cap \rho(C), \tag{18}$$

if the $\phi_i(\omega)$, $i = 1, \cdots, M$, are defined according to Eq.(17).

Applying Krein's formula ($\bar{A} = \bar{H}_X$, $B = H_{U,X}$, $C = H_0$ and hence $\dot{A} = \bar{H}_X$, $M = N$), we obtain the relation for $U \neq -1$,

$$(\omega - H_{U,X})^{-1} = (\omega - H_0)^{-1} - \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \lambda_{ij}(\omega)\langle \psi_j(\bar{\omega}), \cdot \rangle \psi_i(\omega), \tag{19}$$

where $\lambda^{-1}(\omega)$ satisfies

$$\lambda_{ij}^{-1}(\omega) - \lambda_{ij}^{-1}(\omega') = -(\omega - \omega')\langle \psi_j(\bar{\omega}), \psi_i(\omega')\rangle = G_{ij}^{(0)}(\omega) - G_{ij}^{(0)}(\omega'), \quad i,j = 1, \cdots, N. \tag{20}$$

Here we set

$$G_{ij}^{(0)}(\omega) \equiv G^{(0)}(\vec{x}_i, \vec{x}_j; \omega) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\varphi_n(\vec{x}_i)\varphi_n(\vec{x}_j)}{\omega - \varepsilon_n}. \tag{21}$$

The second equality in Eq.(20) follows from the resolvent formula

$$(\omega - \omega')(\omega - H_0)^{-1}(\omega' - H_0)^{-1} = (\omega' - H_0)^{-1} - (\omega - H_0)^{-1}. \tag{22}$$

Each term on the right hand side in Eq.(20) is a divergent series for $i = j$. However, the divergence cancels each other. The most important indication of Krein's formula is that it is sufficient to define $\lambda(\omega)$ for some fixed ω since then $\lambda(\omega)$ for any ω follows from Eq.(20).

The Green's function of $H_{U,X}$ is given by the coordinate representation of the resolvent Eq.(19);

$$G_{U,X}(\vec{x}, \vec{x}'; \omega) \equiv (\omega - H_{U,X})^{-1}(\vec{x}, \vec{x}') = G^{(0)}(\vec{x}, \vec{x}'; \omega) - \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} G^{(0)}(\vec{x}, \vec{x}_i; \omega)\lambda_{ij}(\omega)G^{(0)}(\vec{x}_j, \vec{x}'; \omega). \tag{23}$$

From Eq.(23), we recognize that $-\lambda(\omega)$ corresponds to the transition matrix (T-matrix) in the presence of N point interactions. It follows from Eq.(13) that

$$(\omega - H_{U,X})(\psi_{i+} + \sum_{j=1}^{N} U_{ij}\psi_{j-}) = (\omega - i\Lambda)\psi_{i+} + (\omega + i\Lambda)\sum_{j=1}^{N} U_{ij}\psi_{j-}. \tag{24}$$

Setting $\omega = -i\Lambda$ in Eq.(24), we get

$$(-i\Lambda - H_{U,X})^{-1}\psi_{i+} = -\frac{1}{2i\Lambda}(\psi_{i+} + \sum_{j=1}^{N} U_{ij}\psi_{j-}). \tag{25}$$

On the other hand, Eq.(19) shows that the left hand side in Eq.(25) is written as

$$(-i\Lambda - H_{U,X})^{-1}\psi_{i+} = (-i\Lambda - H_0)^{-1}\psi_{i+} - \sum_{j,k=1}^{N} \lambda_{jk}(-i\Lambda)\langle \psi_{k+}, \psi_{i+}\rangle \psi_{j-}. \tag{26}$$

The resolvent formula (22) indicates

$$(-i\Lambda - H_0)^{-1}\psi_{i+} = -\frac{1}{2i\Lambda}(\psi_{i+} - \psi_{i-}), \tag{27}$$

$$\langle \psi_{k+}, \psi_{i+}\rangle = \frac{1}{2i\Lambda}(G_{ki}^{(0)}(-i\Lambda) - G_{ki}^{(0)}(i\Lambda)) = \frac{1}{2i\Lambda}(\lambda_{ki}^{-1}(-i\Lambda) - \lambda_{ki}^{-1}(i\Lambda)), \tag{28}$$

where the second equality in Eq.(28) follows from Eq.(20). Substituting Eqs.(27) and (28) into Eq.(26) and compared with Eq.(25), we obtain the relation between the unitary matrix and the T-matrix,

$$U_{ij} = -\delta_{ij} + \sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_{jk}(-i\Lambda)(\lambda_{ki}^{-1}(-i\Lambda) - \lambda_{ki}^{-1}(i\Lambda)) = -\sum_{k=1}^{N} \lambda_{jk}(-i\Lambda)\lambda_{ki}^{-1}(i\Lambda), \tag{29}$$

or equivalently

$$U = -^t[\lambda(-i\Lambda)\lambda^{-1}(i\Lambda)] \tag{30}$$

in a simple matrix form. Noticing that Eq.(19) implies

$$\lambda(\omega)^\dagger = \lambda(\bar{\omega}), \tag{31}$$

we realize that the unitarity of U is equivalent to the fact that $\lambda(i\Lambda)$ (resp. $\lambda(-i\Lambda)$) is a normal matrix.

III. THE CASE OF SINGLE INTERACTION

In case of a single point interaction, a general form of $\lambda(\omega) \in \mathbf{C}$ which satisfies Eqs.(20) and (31) is given by

$$\lambda^{-1}(\omega) = \bar{G}(\omega) - \bar{v}^{-1}, \tag{32}$$

where

$$\bar{G}(\omega) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \varphi_n(\vec{x}_1)^2 (\frac{1}{\omega - \varepsilon_n} + \frac{\varepsilon_n}{\varepsilon_n^2 + \Lambda^2}), \tag{33}$$

$$\bar{v}^{-1} = \Lambda \cot\frac{\theta}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\varphi_n(\vec{x}_1)^2}{\varepsilon_n^2 + \Lambda^2}, \quad 0 \le \theta < 2\pi. \tag{34}$$

(Actually it would have been sufficient to define $\lambda(i\Lambda)$ since $\lambda(\omega)$ is calculated from Eq.(20) with $N = 1$, as mentioned in the previous section.) At first sight, the second term in Eq.(33) seems to be redundant since it is energy-independent. However, it plays an essential role in making the problem well-defined; The infinite series in Eq.(33) does not converge without the second term. For spatial dimension $d \ge 4$, in general, the summation in Eq.(33) diverges. This reflects the fact that the billiard problem with point interactions is not well-defined for $d \ge 4$ in quantum mechanics. The energy independence of the counterterm also ensures that $\lambda(\omega)$ in Eq.(32) satisfies Eq.(20). (Note that, apart from the counterterm, $\bar{G}(\omega)$ has the same form as $G_{11}^{(0)}(\omega)$.) As one varies $0 \le \theta < 2\pi$ for some fixed Λ, the value of $\bar{v}$, which is also energy-independent, ranges over the whole real number. We can formally consider $\bar{v}$ as a coupling strength of the point interaction. Its relation to physical strength of the interaction has been discussed elsewhere [8]. Here we just mention that the system approaches the empty billiard in the limit of $\bar{v} \to 0$. Inserting $\lambda(\omega)$ in Eq.(32) together with Eqs.(33) and (34) into Eq.(30), we get a simple expression of U which manifests the unitarity;

$$U = -e^{i\theta}, \tag{35}$$

irrespective to the value of Λ.

The eigenvalues for the system perturbed by a single point interaction with coupling strength $\bar{v}$ located at $\vec{x}_1$ are obtained as the solutions of the equation

$$\lambda^{-1}(\omega) = 0, \tag{36}$$

namely

$$\bar{G}(\omega) = \bar{v}^{-1}. \tag{37}$$

Eq.(33) shows that within any interval between two neighboring unperturbed eigenvalues, $\bar{G}(\omega)$ is a monotonically decreasing function that ranges over the whole real number. This means that Eq.(37) has a single solution on each interval;

$$\begin{array}{ll} \varepsilon_1 < \omega_1 < \varepsilon_2 < \omega_2 < \varepsilon_3 < \omega_3 < \cdots\cdots, & \text{for } \bar{v} > 0, \\ \omega_1 < \varepsilon_1 < \omega_2 < \varepsilon_2 < \omega_3 < \varepsilon_3 < \cdots\cdots, & \text{for } \bar{v} < 0. \end{array} \tag{38}$$

The eigenfunction corresponding to an eigenvalue ω_n is written in terms of Green's function of the empty billiard as

$$\psi_n(\vec{x}) = N_n G^{(0)}(\vec{x}, \vec{x}_1; \omega_n) = N_n \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\varphi_k(\vec{x_1})}{\omega_n - \varepsilon_k} \varphi_k(\vec{x}), \quad n = 1, \cdots \tag{39}$$

with a normalization constant

$$N_n = 1 \Bigg/ \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\varphi_k(\vec{x}_1)}{\omega_n - \varepsilon_k} \right)^2}, \quad n = 1, \cdots. \tag{40}$$

In order to obtain each solution of Eq.(37), a numerical task is needed in general. Our main purpose is, however, to examine under what conditions a point interaction brings about a significant effect in the statistical properties of spectrum. To achieve our aim without losing the essence, while still keeping loss of generality minimal, we introduce some approximations as follows. The first (and main) one is that the value of (the square of) each wave function at $\vec{x}_1$ is replaced by its average among many;

$$\varphi_n(\vec{x}_1)^2 \simeq \langle \varphi_n(\vec{x}_1)^2 \rangle = 1/S. \tag{41}$$

Since it is often the case that the statistics are taken within a large number of, sometimes thousands of eigenstates (with $\vec{x}_1$ and $\bar{v}$ fixed), Eq.(41) is quite satisfactory. Note that the second equality in Eq.(41) is valid irrespective to the exact position of the interaction $\vec{x}_1$ as well as the energy region where the average is taken. Keeping Eq.(41) in mind, we recognize from Eq.(39) that if a perturbed eigenvalue ω_n is close to an unperturbed one ε_n (or ε_{n+1}), then the corresponding eigenfunction ψ_n is not substantially different from φ_n (or φ_{n+1}). Thus, the disturbance by a point interaction is mainly restricted to eigenstates with an eigenvalue around which $\bar{G}(\omega)$ has an inflection point. This is because each inflection point of $\bar{G}(\omega)$ is expected to appear, on average, around the midpoint on the interval between two neighboring unperturbed eigenvalues. Let $(\tilde{\omega}, \bar{G}(\tilde{\omega}))$ be one of such inflection points of $\bar{G}(\omega)$; $\tilde{\omega} \simeq (\varepsilon_m + \varepsilon_{m+1})/2$ for some m. In this case, the contributions on $\bar{G}(\tilde{\omega})$ from the terms with $n \simeq m$ cancel each other, and we can approximate the summation in Eq.(33) by a principal integral with a high degree of accuracy;

$$\bar{G}(\tilde{\omega}) \simeq \bar{g}(\tilde{\omega}), \tag{42}$$

$$\bar{g}(\omega) = \langle \varphi_n(\vec{x}_1)^2 \rangle \rho_{av} P \int_0^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{\omega - E} + \frac{E}{E^2 + \Lambda^2} \right) dE, \tag{43}$$

where we have defined a continuous function $\bar{g}(\omega)$ which behaves like an interpolation of the inflection points of $\bar{G}(\omega)$. Clearly, $\bar{G}(\omega) \simeq \bar{g}(\omega)$ is valid only around the inflection points of $\bar{G}(\omega)$. Using an elementary indefinite integral

$$\int \left(\frac{1}{\omega - E} + \frac{E}{E^2 + \Lambda^2} \right) dE = -\ln \frac{|\omega - E|}{\sqrt{E^2 + \Lambda^2}}, \tag{44}$$

we obtain

$$\bar{G}(\tilde{\omega}) \simeq \langle \varphi_n(\vec{x}_1)^2 \rangle \rho_{av} \ln \frac{\tilde{\omega}}{\Lambda} \simeq \frac{M}{2\pi} \ln \frac{\tilde{\omega}}{\Lambda}, \tag{45}$$

where the second equality follows from Eqs.(5) and (41). Eq.(45) indicates that the maximal coupling of a point interaction is attained with the coupling strength $\bar{v}$ which satisfies

$$\bar{v}^{-1} \simeq \frac{M}{2\pi} \ln \frac{\omega}{\Lambda}. \tag{46}$$

The "width" of the strong coupling region (allowable error of $\bar{v}^{-1}$ in Eq.(46)) can be estimated by considering a linearized eigenvalue equation. Expanding $\bar{G}(\omega)$ at $\omega = \tilde{\omega}$, we can rewrite Eq.(37) as

$$\bar{G}(\tilde{\omega}) + \bar{G}'(\tilde{\omega})(\omega - \tilde{\omega}) \simeq \bar{v}^{-1} \tag{47}$$

or

$$\bar{G}'(\tilde{\omega})(\omega - \tilde{\omega}) \simeq \bar{v}^{-1} - \frac{M}{2\pi} \ln \frac{\tilde{\omega}}{\Lambda}. \tag{48}$$

In order to ensure that the perturbed eigenvalue is close to $\tilde{\omega}$, the range of the right hand side in Eq.(48) has to be restricted to

$$\left|\bar{v}^{-1} - \frac{M}{2\pi}\ln\frac{\tilde{\omega}}{\Lambda}\right| \lesssim \frac{\delta_{\bar{v}^{-1}}}{2} \tag{49}$$

where the width $\delta_{\bar{v}^{-1}}$ is defined by

$$\delta_{\bar{v}^{-1}} \equiv \left|\bar{G}'(\tilde{\omega})\right| \rho_{av}^{-1}. \tag{50}$$

This is nothing but the average variance of the linearized $\bar{G}$ on the interval between the two unperturbed eigenvalues just below and above $\tilde{\omega}$. Using the approximation in Eq.(41), the value of $\left|\bar{G}'(\tilde{\omega})\right|$ can be estimated as follows;

$$\left|\bar{G}'(\tilde{\omega})\right| = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(\frac{\varphi_n(\vec{x}_1)}{\tilde{\omega}-\varepsilon_n}\right)^2 \simeq \langle\varphi_n(\vec{x}_1)^2\rangle\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{2}{\{(n-\frac{1}{2})\rho_{av}^{-1}\}^2} = 8\langle\varphi_n(\vec{x}_1)^2\rangle\rho_{av}^2\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{(2n-1)^2} = \pi^2\langle\varphi_n(\vec{x}_1)^2\rangle\rho_{av}^2. \tag{51}$$

The second equality follows from the approximation that the unperturbed eigenvalues are distributed with a mean interval ρ_{av}^{-1} in the whole energy region. This assumption is quite satisfactory, since the denominator of $\bar{G}'(\omega)$ is of the order of $(\omega-\varepsilon_n)^2$, indicating that the summation in Eq.(51) converges rapidly. From Eq.(51), we obtain

$$\delta_{\bar{v}^{-1}} \simeq \pi^2\langle\varphi_n(\vec{x}_1)^2\rangle\rho_{av} \simeq \frac{\pi M}{2}. \tag{52}$$

From Eqs.(49) and (52), we recognize that the effect of a point interaction of coupling strength $\bar{v}$ on statistical properties of spectrum is substantial only in the eigenstates with eigenvalue ω such that

$$\left|\bar{v}^{-1} - \frac{M}{2\pi}\ln\frac{\omega}{\Lambda}\right| \lesssim \frac{\delta_{\bar{v}^{-1}}}{2} \simeq \frac{\pi M}{4} \simeq M. \tag{53}$$

We do not go into details of numerical experiments in this paper, but just mention that the validity of the conjecture (53) has been confirmed by examining the spectrum of rectangular billiards with a single point interaction inside [8]. Concerning the nearest-neighbor level spacing distribution $P(S)$, a level repulsion seen in Eq.(2) is observed under the condition (53), while $P(S)$ is not substantially different from the Poisson prediction, Eq.(1), otherwise.

Before closing this section, we give a short comment on the shape of the billiard. Our implicit assumption for the shape is that the average level density of the empty billiard is dominated by the area term, which does not depend on energy. The assumption is justified for a generic two-dimensional billiard which has the same order of length scale in each direction, irrespective to a full detail of the shape of the billiard.

IV. THE CASE OF MULTIPLE INTERACTIONS

We intend to generalize Eq.(32) to finitely many point interactions. This is achieved by introducing the N-parameter family of self-adjoint extensions of $\bar{H}_X$ defined by the unitary matrix U, Eq.(30), together with

$$\lambda_{ij}^{-1}(\omega) = \begin{cases} \bar{G}_i(\omega) - \bar{v}_i^{-1}, & \text{for } i=j, \quad \bar{v}_i \in \mathbf{R}, \\ G_{ij}^{(0)}(\omega), & \text{for } i\neq j, \end{cases} \qquad i,j=1,\cdots,N, \tag{54}$$

where $G_{ij}^{(0)}(\omega)$ is defined in Eq.(21) and

$$\bar{G}_i(\omega) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\varphi_n(\vec{x}_i)^2\left(\frac{1}{\omega-\varepsilon_n} + \frac{\varepsilon_n}{\varepsilon_n^2+\Lambda^2}\right), \quad i=1,\cdots,N. \tag{55}$$

Eq.(54) with opposite sign describes the T-matrix of the system with N point interactions which satisfy separated boundary conditions at each point $\vec{x}_i$. The coupling strength of the i-th interaction is assigned by a real number $\bar{v}_i$, $i=1,\cdots,N$. The eigenvalues of this system are the poles of the T-matrix, determined by

$$\det\ \lambda^{-1}(\omega) = 0. \tag{56}$$

Qualitative behavior of the eigenvalues of $\lambda^{-1}(\omega)$ as a function of ω can be examined as follows. Let us cut the infinite series of each matrix element of $\lambda^{-1}(\omega)$ at n_{max} which satisfies $\omega \ll \epsilon_{n_{max}}$. We then have

$$\lambda^{-1}(\omega) = \lim_{n_{max}\to\infty} \Sigma^{(0)}(\omega) \tag{57}$$

where $\Sigma^{(0)}(\omega)$ is a sum of an "unperturbed part" $T^{(0)}$ and an "interaction part" $V^{(0)}(\omega)$;

$$\Sigma^{(0)}(\omega) = T^{(0)} + V^{(0)}(\omega) \tag{58}$$

with

$$T^{(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} d_1^{(0)} & & & 0 \\ & d_2^{(0)} & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ 0 & & & d_N^{(0)} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad V^{(0)}(\omega) = \sum_{n=1}^{n_{max}} \frac{1}{\omega - \varepsilon_n} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_n^{(0)}(\vec{x}_1) \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \varphi_n^{(0)}(\vec{x}_N) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_n^{(0)}(\vec{x}_1) & \cdots & \varphi_n^{(0)}(\vec{x}_N) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{59}$$

Here we set

$$d_i^{(0)} = \sum_{n=1}^{n_{max}} \varphi_n(\vec{x}_i)^2 \frac{\varepsilon_n}{\varepsilon_n^2 + \Lambda^2} - \bar{v}_i^{-1}, \qquad \varphi_n^{(0)}(\vec{x}_i) = \varphi_n(\vec{x}_i), \qquad i = 1, \cdots, N. \tag{60}$$

The N-dimensional matrix $\Sigma^{(0)}(\omega)$ formally has a form similar to the Hamiltonian with n_{max} rank-one (separable) interactions. We realize that $d_i^{(0)}$ takes a role of the "unperturbed energy", while the inverse of $\omega - \varepsilon_n$ corresponds to the "strength" of the n-th interaction. In the following, we assume that $d_1^{(0)} < d_2^{(0)} < \cdots < d_N^{(0)}$ without a loss of generality.

The eigenvalues of $\Sigma^{(0)}(\omega)$ can be obtained in a perturbative manner as follows. We start by setting $k = 1$ and define

$$\tilde{T}^{(k)}(\omega) = T^{(k-1)}(\omega) + \frac{1}{\omega - \varepsilon_k} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_k^{(k-1)}(\vec{x}_1) \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \varphi_k^{(k-1)}(\vec{x}_N) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_k^{(k-1)}(\vec{x}_1) & \cdots & \varphi_k^{(k-1)}(\vec{x}_N) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{61}$$

Namely, only the first term in the summation of $V^{(k-1)}(\omega)$ is taken into account in the matrix $\tilde{T}^{(k)}(\omega)$. Since $\tilde{T}^{(k)}(\omega)$ has a single rank-one interaction, we obtain the eigenvalues of $\tilde{T}^{(k)}(\omega)$ as the solutions $d_i^{(k)}$, $i = 1, \cdots, N$, of the equation

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\varphi_k^{(k-1)}(\vec{x}_i)^2}{d^{(k)} - d_i^{(k-1)}} = \omega - \varepsilon_k. \tag{62}$$

It is worthy to note that

$$d_{i-1}^{(k-1)} < d_i^{(k)} < d_i^{(k-1)} \quad \text{for} \quad \omega < \varepsilon_k, \qquad d_i^{(k-1)} < d_i^{(k)} < d_{i+1}^{(k-1)} \quad \text{for} \quad \omega > \varepsilon_k. \tag{63}$$

We define an orthogonal transformation $\Omega^{(k)}(\omega)$ such that the matrix $\tilde{T}^{(k)}(\omega)$ is diagonal in the new basis,

$$T^{(k)}(\omega) \equiv {}^t\Omega^{(k)}(\omega)\tilde{T}^{(k)}(\omega)\Omega^{(k)}(\omega) = \begin{pmatrix} d_1^{(k)} & & & 0 \\ & d_2^{(k)} & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ 0 & & & d_N^{(k)} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{64}$$

Clearly, the i-th column of $\Omega^{(k)}(\omega)$ is given by the normalized eigenfunction corresponding to the i-th eigenvalue $d_i^{(k)}$, the exact form of which is unnecessary in the present argument. With the new basis, the new Hamiltonian matrix has a form

$$\Sigma^{(k)}(\omega) \equiv {}^t\Omega^{(k)}(\omega)\Sigma^{(k-1)}(\omega)\Omega^{(k)}(\omega) = T^{(k)}(\omega) + V^{(k)}(\omega), \tag{65}$$

where

$$V^{(k)}(\omega) = \sum_{n=k+1}^{n_{max}} \frac{1}{\omega - \varepsilon_n} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_n^{(k)}(\vec{x}_1) \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \varphi_n^{(k)}(\vec{x}_N) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_n^{(k)}(\vec{x}_1) & \cdots & \varphi_n^{(k)}(\vec{x}_N) \end{pmatrix} \tag{66}$$

together with

$$\begin{pmatrix} \varphi_n^{(k)}(\vec{x}_1) & \cdots & \varphi_n^{(k)}(\vec{x}_N) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_n^{(k-1)}(\vec{x}_1) & \cdots & \varphi_n^{(k-1)}(\vec{x}_N) \end{pmatrix} \Omega^{(k)}(\omega), \quad n = k+1, \cdots, n_{max}. \tag{67}$$

The new interaction matrix $V^{(k)}(\omega)$ keeps the separability of the interaction, while the number of the terms decreases by one, compared to $V^{(k-1)}(\omega)$. The procedure mentioned above can be repeated for $k = 2, \cdots, n_{max}$, successively. After the repetition, we obtain $d_i^{(n_{max})}$, $i = 1, \cdots, N$, which are exactly the eigenvalues of $\Sigma^{(0)}(\omega)$.

The above algorithm serves to understand the qualitative behavior of the eigenvalues of $\lambda^{-1}(\omega)$. The eigenvalue equation (62) indicates that if ε_k is far from the energy ω under consideration, the "strength" of the rank-one interaction, $(\omega - \varepsilon_k)^{-1}$, is very weak and it has little effect except that each eigenvalue shifts by

$$d_i^{(k)} \simeq d_i^{(k-1)} + \frac{\varphi_k^{(k-1)}(\vec{x}_i)^2}{\omega - \varepsilon_k} \simeq d_i^{(k-1)} + \frac{1}{S(\omega - \varepsilon_k)}. \tag{68}$$

This means that $\Omega^{(k)}(\omega)$ substantially differs from the unit matrix only in case of $\varepsilon_k \simeq \omega$. Thus, we can approximate $\Sigma^{(0)}(\omega)$ by

$$\Sigma^{(0)}(\omega) \simeq \bar{T}(\omega) + \bar{V}(\omega) \tag{69}$$

with

$$\bar{T}(\omega) = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{d}_1 & & & 0 \\ & \bar{d}_2 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ 0 & & & \bar{d}_N \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \bar{V}(\omega) = \sum_{\epsilon_n \simeq \omega} \frac{1}{\omega - \varepsilon_n} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_n(\vec{x}_1) \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \varphi_n(\vec{x}_N) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_n(\vec{x}_1) & \cdots & \varphi_n(\vec{x}_N) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{70}$$

Here we set

$$\bar{d}_i = \sum_{n=1}^{n_{max}} \varphi_n(\vec{x}_i)^2 \frac{\varepsilon_n}{\varepsilon_n^2 + \Lambda^2} + \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ \varepsilon_n \not\simeq \omega}}^{n_{max}} \frac{\varphi_n(\vec{x}_i)^2}{\omega - \epsilon_n} - \bar{v}_i^{-1}, \quad i = 1, \cdots, N. \tag{71}$$

Note that $\bar{d}_i$ shows the tracks of the discard terms in $\bar{V}(\omega)$. In the limit of $n_{max} \to \infty$, we can estimate

$$\bar{d}_i \simeq \frac{M}{2\pi} \ln \frac{\omega}{\Lambda} - \bar{v}_i^{-1} \tag{72}$$

as before. Since the shift of eigenvalues caused by rank-one interactions is limited [see Eq.(63)], we expect from Eq.(70) together with Eq.(72) that the condition (53) for a single point interaction can be generalized to the case of multiple interactions. Namely, the i-th interaction with strength $\bar{v}_i$ affects the spectral properties in the energy region which satisfies

$$\left| \bar{v}_i^{-1} - \frac{M}{2\pi} \ln \frac{\omega}{\Lambda} \right| \lesssim \frac{\pi M}{4} \simeq M. \tag{73}$$

V. CONCLUSION

We have discussed the spectral properties of two-dimensional Laplacian with a finite number of point interactions. In spite of the apparent simplicity, careful treatments are required for point interactions. Based on the self-adjoint extension theory in functional analysis, we have deduced the Green's function appropriate for the operator. The problem is based on obvious physical motivations. The operator exactly corresponds to the quantum-mechanical Hamiltonian for a point particle moving in a two-dimensional bounded region (billiard) with point impurities inside. Based on a general argument, we have clarified the condition under which the statistical properties of spectrum are substantially influenced by the point interactions. The findings are summarized as follows;

(1) For a two-dimensional billiard, the effect of a point interaction with coupling strength $\bar{v}$ on statistical properties of spectrum is maximal under the condition

$$\bar{v}^{-1} \simeq \frac{M}{2\pi} \ln \frac{\omega}{\Lambda}, \tag{74}$$

where M is the mass of a particle moving in the billiard and Λ is an arbitrary mass scale. This indicates that the maximal coupling region shifts with a logarithmic dependence of the energy ω in two dimension.

(2) The width $\delta_{\bar{v}^{-1}}$ (or an allowable error in $\bar{v}^{-1}$ to look for the effect) is estimated as

$$\delta_{\bar{v}^{-1}} \simeq \frac{\pi M}{2}, \tag{75}$$

which is energy-independent. If the value of $\bar{v}^{-1}$ differs from the right hand side in Eq.(74) to the extent of Eq.(75) at energy ω, the effect of the point interaction on the statistics tends to disappear.

(3) (1) and (2) are generalized to the case of multiple point interactions under separated boundary conditions. If we collect the interactions with the same order of magnitude of the coupling strength as a single group, we expect that the interactions belonging to one of such groups disturb the particle motion in a "coherent" manner in the energy region determined by Eq.(74) [9], while their influence hardly appears in different energy regions where the difference between both sides in Eq.(74) is larger than Eq.(75).

---

[1] O. Bohigas, in *Random Matrix Theories and Chaotic Dynamics*, Les Houches Summer School Proceedings Session 52, edited by M.-J. Giannoni, A. Voros and J. Zinn-Justin (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1989), p.87.

[2] F. J. Dyson and M. L. Mehta, J. Math. Phys. **4**, 701 (1963).

[3] M. L. Mehta, *Random Matrices and the Statistical Theory of Energy Levels* (Academic Press, New York, 1967), new revised and enlarged edition, 1990.

[4] S. Albeverio, F. Gesztesy, R. Høegh-Krohn and H. Holden, *Solvable Models in Quantum Mechanics* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988).

[5] J. Zorbas, J. Math. Phys. **21**, 840 (1980).

[6] J. von Neumann, *Mathematische Grundlagen der Quantenmechanik* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1932) [English edition: *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1955)].

[7] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics*, Vol. 2, *Fourier Analysis, Self-adjointness* (Academic Press, New York, 1975).

[8] T. Shigehara, Phys. Rev. **E50**, 4357 (1994).

[9] T. Cheon and T. Shigehara, Phys. Rev. **E54**, 3300 (1996).